

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Figs 1-5 These sheets, which includes Figs. 1A, 1B and 2-5, replace the original sheets including Figs. 1-5.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets, 4 pages

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Drawing Objections

The Examiner has objected to the handwritten labels and Figure headers. These have been replaced with computer generated symbols.

The Examiner has requested that Fig. 1 be divided into separate Figures, for example Fig 1A and Fig. 1B. This has been done. Fig. 1A and Fig 1B are now provided on separate pages.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the drawing objections.

Specification Objections

The Examiner has objected to typographical errors in paragraphs [0054] and [0060]. These errors have been corrected.

Also paragraphs [0047] and [0050] have been amended to be consistent with the amended Figures.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respected.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 14, 16-22 and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 5,228,806 to De Medieros, Jr. et al. (hereinafter De Medieros). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

De Medieros is directed to a gravity pile for platform foundations which comprises a series of pile sections made from two concentric tubes, the annular space between which is filled with an elevated specific weight composition such as mortar or hematite. Individual pile sections can be joined together by means of tubular connecting rings welded to the ends of the sections and welded or screwed to each other.

Claim 1, as amended includes the features of dependent claim 14, and additional features. It is believed that De Medieros does not disclose all of the features of amended claim 1. Specifically, De Medieros does not disclose a junction piece that connects the construction to the pile-like device and a connection between the pile-like device and junction piece adapted to transmit bending moments. Rather, De Medieros discloses a tubular ring forming a connection between piles and a template, but not a construction. Further, the tubular ring is not adapted to transmit bending moments from the construction to the pile-like device.

Claims 2-6, 10 and 16-19 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons stated above.

Regarding independent claim 20 which includes a junction piece disposed over a pile-like device, this claim has been amended to state that the connection between the pile like device and junction piece is adapted to transmit bending moments. As stated above, this feature is not disclosed by De Medieros. Claims 21-22 and 24-25 depend directly or indirectly from claim 20 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons stated above.

Independent claim 26 has been amended to include the features of claim 27, now cancelled, and is believed to be allowable at least for the reasons stated above.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, under section 102, of claims 1-6, 8, 10, 16-22, and 24-26 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Medieros in view of U.S. 3,851,483 to Holley Jr. For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed. Claims 9 and 13 depend from claim 1 which is believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above. Holley Jr. does not cure the deficiencies in De Medieros with respect to the claimed invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 13 under section 103 is respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Medieros in view of U.S. 3,851,483 to Holley Jr. and U.S. 2,080,406 to Allen. For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed. Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 1 which is believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above. Holley Jr. does not cure the deficiencies in De Medieros with respect to the claimed invention, nor does Allen. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11 and 12 under section 103 is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Medieros. Claim 15 is believed to be allowable for least the same reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 under section 103 is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite

prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. SCH-16446.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL & CLARK LLP

By /James A. Balazs/
James A. Balazs, Reg. No. 47401

38210 Glenn Avenue
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7808
(216) 566-9700